

THE MYSTERIOUS DEATHS OF CHOLA AMBASSADORS AT GUANGZHOU

K. V. Ramakrishna Rao*

Introduction

The T'ang (618-906 CE) and Song (960-1279) periods, that coincide with the reign of the Imperial Cholas (950-1250) and their interaction, is studied in the context of maritime trade, competition and rivalry for domination in the South East Asian region during 10th - 13th centuries. The inflow of the Buddhists into China through the silk-road was more than through the sea-route. Similarly, large number of Chinese Buddhists started going to India "in search of Buddhist texts, Buddha's relics" and particularly to "learn Buddhism in its place of birth"¹. The Sung / Song dynasty, the successors of the T'angs, continued the policy of exchange. The Buddhism played a crucial role in such interactions and encounters, though, during the T'ang period, it was suspected as the intrusion of Indians in the Chinese domain². During the T'sang reign itself, a memorandum was submitted to the Emperor in 624 CE decrying the Buddhist practices incompatible with the Chinese society³. Such anti-Buddhist attitude turned into persecution of Buddhists in China in 845 resulting in the destruction of about 4600 temples and defrocking of 260,500 monks and nuns. Further, the Arab occupation of Central Asia in the 9th century and its expansion from 10th century onwards through China and India interrupted the free intercourse between the two countries⁴. During the Sung dynasty the situation improved, as could be noted from the Chinese chronicles that record the frequent visits of

Indians to the Chinese Imperial Court, but under controlled and monitored conditions. The anti-Buddhist posture also resulted in anti-Indian attitude.

Why Tantric Buddhism dominated during the Sung period (960-1279)?

At the end of the eighth century, Buddhism gradually lost support at the Chinese court, and Buddhist transmission and translation work was suspended because of the political and economic decline of the late Tang and the subsequent social disorder during the five dynasties period. However, in the beginning of the Song dynasty (960-1279), Buddhism, particularly, the Tantric Buddhism regained some privileges⁵. Thus, the Buddhist monasteries were restored and mass ordinations by imperial decree revived institutional monastic as well as lay practice. Buddhists were no longer regarded as representatives of a creed "incompatible with traditional values" and regained mainly for political reasons a privileged status at the courts⁶. Though, during the Song period, the Buddhist activities were thus revived, they were curtailed again.

Rejection of Indian Buddhism by the Sung (11th century)

Martin Lehnert⁷ details as to how the Indian Buddhism was rejected by the Chinese as follows. The Chinese forced for internal canonisation, debating over adoption of the Tang and pre-Tang translations. Thus, they wanted to fuse with

* Independent Researcher, Director - Institute for the Study of Ancient Indian Arts and Sciences

Confucian and Daoist traditions rejecting Indian monastic codices, but the superimposition of Chan monastic rules on the Indian that was prevalent since the Northern and Southern Dynasties period. Particularly, the scholar-monk Zanning (919-1001) argued for a separation of Buddhist praxis and learning from any Indian context, and constructed a Chinese Buddhist antiquity disapproving the contributions of Indian monks. As Zanning emphasized Chan and its "Chinese origin", the "Indian" appeal of the Tantric pantheon, practice as well as the ostentatious luxury of rituals gradually became obstacles and redundant. So, influential Chinese Buddhists petitioned to halt the state funding for India translation work. Thus, the Buddhist translation work accomplished during the reign of the first four Song emperors ceased almost completely after the death of Dharmapala (Chin. Fahu ,?) in 1058 and the Tantric Ritual work could not be completed⁶. The Song emperors started to implement the doctrines of the Confucianism, as they found that the practice of Buddhism would not help the pursuance of trade and commercial activities. The Confucians and Daoists considered Buddhists as their enemies and Buddhism as threat to the Chinese society and thus with the connivance of rulers, they controlled, threatened and persecuted the Buddhists. Neo-Confucianism dominated the Sung period and the economic reform brought in 1070-1090 incorporated trained mercenary army.

The Chinese love-hate attitude towards "Tantric Worship" and Implications

Martin Lehnert points out that, during the Song dynasty and later, typical fields of Tantric pragmatics such as exorcism, ghost-possession and divinatory techniques remained viable in local traditions where Daoist and Buddhist praxis had merged⁷. T. Griffith Foulk¹⁰ points out that by the advent of the Song dynasty (960-1279), a period when the Chan movement came to dominate the upper echelons of the Chinese Buddhist monastic institution, all recognised members of the Chan lineage traced their lines of spiritual descent from either Mazu or Shitou¹¹ i.e. from Indian / Buddhist lineages¹². He also arrives at conclusion that the special transmission of "Buddha-mind" through Bodhidharma's lineage first appeared in China in the late seventh century. According to the Chinese texts,

Bodhidharma came from South India. It gradually spread and was adopted by a series of competing groups of Buddhist clergy and lay followers during the Tang dynasty (618-906) and emerged in the Song dynasty (960-1278) as the dominant ideology within the Buddhist monastic institution as a whole. Here, Mazu represents Female deity, Goddess of Sea / Ocean, favourable to the Chinese even today, incidentally, traced back to Manimekhala Goddess / Manimekhala. The association of women and Mother Goddess with the Tantric worship is too well known to be repeated and explained here.

Were the wandering monks of China in the pursuit of Spirituality or Politics?

While the Cholas were sending trade missions with gifts to the Chinese emperors, Chinese Buddhist monks were visiting different parts of India and as well as South India. The important Chan Buddhist teachers e.g., Bodhidharma¹³, were hailing from South India¹⁴. Moreover, the first Buddhist Nuns arrived at China from Lanka¹⁵. Thus, the Chinese concern and attraction towards South is reasonable, as the pursuit of esoteric Buddhism and Tantric practices were accompanied with the participation of women. The exploitation of eunuchs during this period is also shrouded with mystery and it is noted that the Chinese could have used eunuchs to eliminate the Cholas¹⁶. H. Sarkar¹⁷ wondered as, "*The reason for this sudden rise in the number of travelling monks is not known, nor can we account for the sudden break in our relation with Buddhist China in the middle of the 11th century. On the other hand, maritime contact with south India continued throughout the rule of the Sung dynasty, but it was reduced more and more into a one-sided affair. Thus, despite the fact that the Cholas of south India established intimate contact with the Imperial Court, the Sung Annals do not include India among the countries whose merchants traded in 971 A. D.*" Thus, the sudden increase in the inflow of the Chinese Buddhists into India and decline coincide with the decline of goods flowing into and outside of China through the land-route and increase in the sea-route. The Arab occupation of the Central Asia should have forced the trade caravans following the land route through Northeast India and the "Hindu colonies" to reach Chinese cities.

What happened around 1040-1060 CE to create rift between the Chinese and Indian Buddhists?

The observation of H. Sarkar with reference to the sudden break in Indian Buddhist relation with the Buddhist China point to fact that the Chinese wanted to indigenise Buddhism or replaced with Confucianism suitable for trade expansion. The domination of the Cholas under Rajaraja (985-1014 CE) and Rajendra (1012-1044 CE) had been significant with the spread of South Indian merchant guilds throughout Southeast Asia and China. Based on an inscription at Bodhgaya, it is learnt that a Chinese Buddhist group came there in 1033 CE and building of a Stupa in honour of their Emperor Tai-tsung. H. Sarkar considers that this was the last group of the Chinese visited India in 1033 CE and that of Indian visited China in 1036 CE and then, the ties between India and China were broken up which were built up so assiduously by the Buddhist missionaries over a period of ten centuries or more¹⁹. Thus what happened during the period 1040-60 CE has to be analysed critically to find out the facts. The interest Cholas in the north was also evident from the expedition of Rajendra Chola up to the Ganges and his relationship with the Gahadvala and Pala Kings. In fact, the expedition itself could be interpreted for his pursuit to astronomy²⁰, esoteric faith related to Tantric practices and perhaps a counter to the Arab and Chinese intrusions into India from the north-west and north-east regions. These areas were incidentally famous for Tantric worship as evidenced with the metallic and stone icons produced during the 9th-12th cent. period.

The Cholas missions to the Chinese Emperors and their reciprocal treatment

As the researchers have to depend upon the Chinese sources, it is noted that the Cholas had been so enthusiastic in sending their trade delegations, goodwill missions and commercial lobbies with gifts to please the Chinese Emperors. However, "the Chinese Emperors were not recognizing the Cholas as reckoning partners, as compared with the embassies coming from Eastern Turkestan, Pagan, Sri Vijaya and so on. This is simply astonishing, amazing and intriguing. The Song annals also noted that the two embassies came in 1003 and 1008 were from San-fo-ts'i or Sri Vijaya and they were very comfortable with the Chinese. Though, Rajendra reportedly

conquered Sri Vijaya in 1023, within 40-50 years the situation appeared to have been changed completely. Ironically, the delegation that came to the Chinese Court in 1068-1077 claimed that they were entitled to higher rank than the representatives of the Cholas and justified placing the Cholas below the Pagan rulers in 1106. So what transpired the Chinese to treat the Cholas differently has to be probed.

The mysterious deaths of Chola envoys in China

Under the circumstances only, the inexplicable sudden deaths of two ambassadors of the Cholas within 5-6 years happened. The Vice-Minister of Rajaraja, known *San-wan* proceeded to Guangzhou, China in 1015 CE on diplomatic embassy heading 52 members mission²¹. Travelling for 1150 days (more than three years), they reached Guangzhou to meet the Song emperor. The presentation ceremony was held in Kaifeng²², the ten capital of Guangzhou on October 15, 1015. That is, they started from Tanjore in 1012 and reached Kaifeng in 1015. After the mission, when they were returning in 1016, *San-wan* died mysteriously in Xiangyi, in Sui county of Henan province on the Grand Canal. That is the death takes place somewhere in 1016, after travelling a specific distance. Their route shows that they were moving towards the coast, as they might have anchored their ship at some Chinese port on the east. As it would take more than two years time to reach Tanjore, they must have disposed off the body. Haraprasad Ray noted²³ "What happened to his entourage was not known", adding, "Had this envoy returned to India he would have left some account of contemporary China and Sino-Indian relations". This is similar to the fact that the Indian records are neither available nor unknown, about the contribution of the Indian Buddhists to the development of Chinese Buddhism. We have to depend upon the Chinese sources only to know about it. Here also, we come to know that the ambassador died suddenly in 1016 CE unilaterally.

What *San-wan* denotes in the Chinese context?

Here, the curiosity is why the Chola ambassador was named *San-wan*. The name *San-hsing* came into use during the Ch'ing dynasty, though, the original name was *Sari-wan*, a translation of *Dan Tumen*, meaning "Three myriarchies." These myriarchies were: *Odoki*, *Huligai*, and *T'o-wen*. The

myriarchy was a system controlled by ten thousand rulers. Six myriarchies were attributed to Dayan Khan. R. Aurel Stein pointed out at that early date the link between the Tangut royal line, the myriarchy's rulers, and the cleric dispatched by *Dushgsum mkhyan-pa* to the Tangut court. The Western Xia or Hsi-hsia or Tangut state existed from 1038 to 1227 CE in the north-western Chinese provinces of Ningxia, Gansu, eastern Qinghai, northern Shaanxi, north-eastern Xinjiang, south-west inner Mongolia measuring about eight hundred thousand square kilometres. After the fall of T'ang dyanasty, the China was divided into three rival domains of -

1. The Tanguts / Hsi-Hsia in the north-west
2. The Ch'i-tan in the middle
3. The Chin / Cathay in the north and
4. The Sung / Manzi in the south

They were fighting with each other dubbing others as "barbarians" and "enemies". The Ch'i-tan and Tanguts were always trying to capture K'ai-feng, the imperial capital to declare their supremacy over other. In fact, the Ch'i-tan seized K'ai-feng in 947 that resulted in a violent national reaction affecting the Sung. Though the Sung drove the Ch'i-tan beyond the Great Wall, the Tanguts established their kingdom in 990 were threatening them. They recognized the Ch'i-tan as their suzerains and the Chinese / Sung as their enemies. The Tanguts were Tibetan in race, Buddhist in religion and weakest²³ (non-violent in nature). Thus, their state was destroyed by the invading Mongols under Chingiskhan in 1226, who laid foundation for the Yuan dynasty (1271-1368). The destruction erased most of its written records and architecture and hence the founders and history remained controversial until recent research conducted both in the West and within China. They occupied the area of important trade route between North China and Central Asia and the Hexi corridor.

The Tanguts were San-hsing or San-wan

Incidentally, the Tangut rulers existed²⁴ during the period 983-1226 exhibiting strikingly Indian / Buddhist characters as could be recognized from the art and sculptures. Thus, the usage of San-wan name to a Chola ambassador is intriguing. As the Tangut was ruled by many Kings, the India was also

ruled by many rulers. Thus, the Cholas could be "Sari-wan" coming through the land-route and as well as sea-route. As the Tanguts were having royal linkage with myriarchy, but considered as San-hsing or Sari-wan, it is evident that the Sung rulers cautiously treated the Cholas. They might have considered that the Cholas might be having nexus with the Ch'i-tans or Tanguts and hence their "enemies". The misrepresentation of Sri Vijayans would have also added fuel to the fire. Thus, as the particular Chola diplomatic mission that travelled by the land-route reached K'ai-feng, the Sung rulers would have taken action by mistake or otherwise. Incidentally, during the audience of the Chola embassy that reached in 1015, the Chinese ranked them only with those of a vassal state in Eastern Turkestan. Here, the comparison or mention of "Eastern Turkestan" is significant, because, that area was completely under the Indian influence since the first centuries of the Current Era situated in the Silk-route²⁵, but opposed to the Sung after the fall of the T'ang.

***Pa-lan-de-malie-di* - another ambassador died in 1020CE**

In 1020, Rajendra sent *Pa-lan-de-malie-di* to offer tribute, but he died of an illness on his arrival at Guangzhou²⁶. However, the others were sent back with banquets and rich presents. Here also the reason for death is not known, as the translators have not given. Significantly, here Guangzhou is near to the coast and Quanzhou with Tamil settlement. Therefore, they would have buried the dead body there. Here, it has to be noted that some translators, though giving the first death, the second one is not mentioned. Therefore, the mysterious deaths of the ambassadors of the Cholas in China are intriguing. The Heads of the Chola embassy / trade missions could not have died suddenly. They might have been killed by the Chinese to send a warning to the Cholas, as they wanted to dominate the South East Asian areas. The entertaining eunuchs could have played a role in eliminating them. However, there was no reaction from the Cholas. When Rajaraja could punish the Chera King, Rajendra could proceed to Srivijaya to teach a lesson, how could they have kept quiet and continued to send missions with tributes to the Chinese emperors is strange. In 1033, a Chola trade mission was despatched to China. Another was in

1077-1118 and in this, 72 ambassadors-cum-trading mission shareholders were sent²⁷. However, the Cholas settlements in Quanzhou and the Chinese settlements in Nagapattinam and Calicut destroyed / disappeared. Therefore, there were conflicts, disputes and clashes also between the Cholas and the Chinese leading to such incidents.

Whether Chinese adopted foul play leading to the deaths of the Chola ambassadors?

The role of eunuchs played in the Chinese and South East Asian context committing atrocious acts of crimes and violence²⁸ has been noted in many cases. When they could bring downfall to Ming and Tan dynasties inflicting sorrow on the Song women making the dark period for them, they could have very well played such role in the affairs of the Cholas. As the Chinese interpreters were required, just like other SEA countries, the Chinese could have resorted to the services of "*Chinese barbarian officials*"²⁹, who might have undermined the Cholas. The Buddhist role is also suspected, in spite of the grants extended to them in Nagapattinam. The colony of South Indian merchants existed in the port town of Chitian-chou, which has been identified with Zayton of the medieval travellers³⁰, disappeared completely, just like the Tanguts by 13th century.

Conclusion

After the fall of the T'ang dynasty, as the Chinese Empire was divided and the separated groups were fighting with each other to claim supremacy, each group might have been dealing with the merchants and merchandise according to their advantage. The silk-route trade by road was essential for the profits of the involved rulers, dynasties, traders and financiers. As the Cholas started dominating the maritime trade from 11th century onwards, the silk-route trade by sea was under the control of them. Moreover, the goods started moving quickly through the sea-route, as they took less time than the land-route. The Cholas maritime domination necessitated the other competing Arabs and Chinese resort to the same route. Initially, they had to depend upon the Cholas and hence naturally, they wanted to break their monopoly. Of course, as in the lust for power knew no discipline, the aggressive and belligerent trading communities also followed the unethical practices like duplicity, contraband, piracy

and all sorts of clandestine activities. Thus, the attitude of the Sung rulers towards the Cholas is explicit. Moreover, the competitors were also misinterpreting, misrepresenting and carrying out misinformation campaign against the Cholas. Thus, the Sri Vijaya rulers were hobnobbing with the Sung and claiming that the Cholas were their subordinates. The Arabs were too presenting Indian goods as "Persian goods"³¹.

In other words, the Chinese always treated their opponents as foreigners, barbarians, enemies, and hence not reliable. Chinese records mention that whenever there were riots among the Chinese garrisons and rebellions, the "foreigners" in lakhs were attacked and killed³². In other words, the culpability of the Chinese could be noted in eliminating their rivals, adversaries and foreigners by any means. Thus, in the context inter-rivalry of the divided Chinese groups and the Arab-Chinese nexus acting against the Cholas, the ambassadors might have been killed by the Chinese to threaten the Cholas. Thus, as pointed out by H. Sarkar, the points could be clarified as follows:

1. The sudden breakage happened in the Indo-Chinese Buddhist relationship might be due to the incompatibility of Buddhism with the trade and commercial policies pursued by the Sung during 1040-60.
2. The Cholas maritime trade continued due to the establishment of the Trade guilds and their spread throughout the South-east Asian region.
3. The reduction in the Cholas maritime trade thereafter had been due to the misinterpreting, misrepresenting and carrying out misinformation campaign against the Cholas.
4. The absence of Indian name in the Chinese records of 971 points to the situation where, the Indian goods were traded through Sri Vijayans and the Arabs posing as their agents.

Chengizkhan destroyed the Chinese divided ruling groups, particularly, the Tanguts in 1226 and the Sung later. Similarly, the Cholas were also reduced to insignificant rulers after the demise of Rajendra.³³ However, the loss of Cholas maritime power resulted in the rise of the Chinese maritime trade in 13th century and the Chinese missions to Malabar and Bengal started increasing.

Table-1 Exchange of Goodwill Missions between India and China

Sl. No.	Period / Century	Number of Missions	From to	The years of visit
1.	5 th	9	From India to China	428, 441, 455, 466, 473, 477
2.	6 th	68	From India to China	502, 503, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 514, 517, 518
3.	7 th	15	From India to China	620, 63, 642, 648, 667, 672, 691, 693
		2	From China to India	647, 648
4.	8 th	24	From India to China	710, 712, 713, 714, 715, 717, 719, 720, 726, 729, 730, 731, 737, 739, 745, 746, 753, 758
5.	10 th	5	From India to China	952, 956, 982, 983, 996
6.	11 th	9	From India to China	1015, 1016, 1020, 1027, 1033, 1034, 1036, 1077
		16	From India to Malabar ³³	1226-1314
7.	14 th	1	From India to China	1360
		3	From India to Malabar	1357, 1359, 1369
8.	15 th	4	From India to China	1411, 1414, 1438, 1439
		2	From China to Bengal	1412, 1415

Note: The details are obtained from the following books and tabulated as above for convenience:

H.S.Bhatia and Tan Chung(Eds.),*Legal and Political System in China*, V ol.I, Deep & Deep Publishing co., New Delhi, 1974, preface, ppo-z.

K.A. Nilakanta Sastry, *Colas*, University of Madras, 1984, p.219, 316-317, 603-606.

It is to be noted that when more visits were made in a particular year, they are merged together.

Initially, the visits of Indians to China were more and after the establishment of Buddhism in China, the visits of the Chinese to India were more.

The trade interests increased with the visits.

From 7th century onwards, the Chinese visits to India increased.

From 8th century onwards, the visits were mutual.

Notes & References

1. Latika Lahiri, *Chinese monks in India*, Motilal Banarasidass, New Delhi, 1986, introduction, p.xxv.
2. <http://www.silk-road.com/art1/buddhism.html>: H. Sarkar, "Buddhist Contact of China", in *Contribution of India to World thought and Culture*, Madras, 1970, p.331.
3. Charles Orzech, Henrik Sorensen and Richard Payne (ed.), *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, Brill, The Netherlands, p.328,
4. The decline of Buddhism along the Silk Road was due to the collapse of the Tang Dynasty in the East and the invasion of Arabs in the West. The conversion to Islam started in the 8th century in Central Asia. Since Islam condemned the iconography, most of the Buddhist statues and wall-paintings were damaged or destroyed.
5. Buddhist temples and stupas were abandoned and buried beneath the sand. By the 15th century, the entire Central Asia basin had been converted to Islam. <http://www.silk-road.com/art1/buddhism.html>.
6. Eichhorn Werner, *Die Religionen Chinas*. Stuttgart, Berlin, Kohlhammer, 1973, pp. 290-293. Quoted by Martin Lehnert, in *The Spread of Buddhism*,(ed.) Ann Heirman and Stephan Peter Bumbacher, p.266.
7. Martin Lehnert, *Tantric Threads between India and China*, in *The Spread of Buddhism*,(ed.) Ann Heirman and Stephan Peter Bumbacher, pp.267-269.

8. Since the Yuan dynasty, the Tantric Buddhist ritualism was replaced at the court by Lamaist liturgy, representing tight relations between the emperor and the Buddhist command of social and imperial order - as pointed out by Martin Lehnert, p.269, fn.81. Qubilai later became the emperor of China and founded the Yuan dynasty (1279-1368) after his victory over the Chinese emperor of the Song Dynasty (960-1279).
9. Martin Lehnert, *Op.cit.*, p.271.
10. T. Griffith Foulk, "The spread of Chan (Zen) Buddhism, in *The Spread of Buddhism*", (ed.) Ann Heirman and Stephan Peter Bumbacher, *Op.cit.*, p.443.
11. *Ibid.*, p.454
12. Albert Welter, "Beyond Lineage Orthodoxy: Yongming Yanshou's Model of Chan as Bodhisattva Cultivation", in *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies, New Taipei, Vol.23, 2013, pp.1-31.
13. The Great Master, Patriarch Ma of Hongzhou said: "When the great master Bodhidharma came from southern India, he exclusively transmitted the greater vehicle teaching of universal mind (*yixin*). He impressed the *Lankavatara sutra* on the minds of sentient beings, fearing that they would not believe this teaching on universal mind. The *Lankavatara Sutra* says: "The mind which the Buddha spoke of is the implicit truth (*zong*); 'gatelessness' (*wumen*) is the dharma-gate." Albert Welter, *Op.cit.*, p.18
14. Paramita Paul, *Wandering Saints: Chan Eccentrics in the Art and Culture of Song and Yuan China*, Amsterdam, 2009, p.18.
15. Ann Heirman, "Vinaya" From India to China, in *The Spread of Buddhism*, *Op.cit.*, pp.182-183.
16. K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, *The Eunuchs and women exploited by the Arabs, the Chinese and the Cholas*, PTNHC, 2011, Erode, p.181.
17. H. Sarkar, *Buddhist Contact of China*, in *Contribution of India to World thought and Culture*, Madras, 1970, p.331.
18. H. Sarkar, "Buddhist Contact of China", in *Contribution of India to World thought and Culture*, Madras, 1970, p.332.
19. K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, *Rajendra Chola's expedition: Northern conquest or Astronomical pursuit*, PSIHC, Chennai, 2012, pp.172-177.
20. It was also known as Canton or Kwangchow is the capital and largest city of the Guangdong province, Guangzhou was an important port during the ancient times as far back as the Qin Dynasty. It served as a trading port as the "Silk Road on the Sea".⁵ The port became one of China's busiest ports during the Ming dynasty and Qing dynasty.
21. Kaifeng is one of the Seven Ancient Capitals of China.
22. Haraprasad Ray, *Trade and trade routes between India and China*, c. 140 B.C.-A.D. 1500, Progressive Publishers, Kolkata, 2003, pp.241-243.
23. J. J. Saunders, *The History of the Mongol conquests*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1971, p.31, 36, 37, 53, 62.
24. Ruth W. Dunnell, *The Great State of White and High: Buddhism and State Formation in Eleventh century Xia*, University of Hawaii Press, USA, 1996.
25. A.F. Rudolf Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist literature found in the Eastern Turkestan*, Sri Satguru Publications, New Delhi, 1988.
26. Noboru Karashima and Tansen Sen, "Chinese texts describing or referring to the Chola kingdom as Zhu-nian," in *Nagapattinam to Suvarnadwipa: Reflections on the Chola Naval Expeditions to Southeast Asia*, (ed.), Helmuth Kulke, K. Kesavapany and Vijay Sakhija, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, 2009, p.299.
27. Mookerji, 1912, p.177.
28. David M. Robinson, *Bandits, eunuchs, and the sons of heaven: rebellion and the economy of violence in Mid-Ming China*, University of Hawaii's Press, USA, 2001.
29. Hok-Lam Chan, The "Chinese Barbarian officials" in the foreign tributary missions to China during the Ming dynasty, pp.411-416.
30. W.W. Rockhill, *Notes On the Relations and Trade of China With the Eastern Archipelago and the*

Coast of the Indian Ocean During the Fourteenth Century, T'oung Pao, Vol.15, No.1-5, 1914, pp.419-447 (29).

31. Even today Indian numerals are known as "Arabic numerals" only and it is how taught to Indian children.

32. Hugh R. Clark, *Muslims and Hindus in the culture and monopolization of Quanzhou from tenth to thirteenth centuries*, Journal of World History, Vol.6.

33. Tansen sen, *The Yuan Khanate and India: Cross-Cultural Diplomacy in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, p 317 and 302.